

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 180 033

CS 502 747

AUTHOR Boomer, Garth
 TITLE Oracy in Australian Schools (Or Doing What Comes Naturally).
 PUB DATE Jul 79
 NOTE 12p.; Paper presented at the Conference on Developing Oral Communication Competence in Children (Armidale, Australia, July 12-18, 1979)
 EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
 DESCRIPTORS Child Language; *Classroom Communication; Educational Needs; Elementary Secondary Education; Foreign Countries; *Language Development; *Language Instruction; *Language Research; Preschool Education; *Speech Communication; Student Teacher Relationship; *Teacher Behavior
 IDENTIFIERS Australia; *Oral Language

ABSTRACT

Based on the assumption that the same conditions that promote talk in the preschool years might continue to promote oracy if they could be replicated in schools, this paper investigates conditions most likely to promote growth in oral communication, summarizes the findings of two relevant Australian research studies, and draws implications for teaching oracy in schools. It first discusses eight factors likely to promote oracy: the tracking by adults of children's language development, empathy and respect for the child's meaning, the use of speech to achieve specific purposes, interactions with adult speakers, word play, situations that provide challenge and involvement, contexts that promote conceptual growth, and exploratory talk. The paper then summarizes findings of a study that revealed the constricting nature of much teacher questioning at the lower primary level and of a study of the talk environment at the secondary level, which suggested that teachers monopolize the talk space and discourage open communication. The paper concludes by pointing out the need for educators to develop situations that make language demands related to those of the real world, to arrange these situations in a developmental sequence, and to translate the known principles of language growth into a workshop-type approach that provides amply for trial, error, and feedback and that ensures that learners see purpose in the endeavor. (GT)

 * Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
 * from the original document. *

Opening Address to the Conference "Developing Oral Communication
Competence in Children" - Armidale, July 1979

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

ORACY IN AUSTRALIAN SCHOOLS

Garth Boomer

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

(Or Doing What Comes Naturally)

Garth Boomer

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

INTRODUCTION

Australian five year olds have not yet come under public attack for failing to talk. Mothers and fathers seem generally pleased with the progress that children have made at this stage. Ten years later these same children are likely to be the object of "high" public and, in particular academic, disapproval as they allegedly mangle, and mumble and muddle their way through spoken Australian English.

If such allegations have any substance, then it might be argued that schools not only exacerbate continued learning to talk but even cause talk to atrophy. On the other hand, it could be argued that learning to unlearn talking is a culturally induced phenomenon which has little to do with Australian schools. Yet another argument, more cynical in spirit, might contend that it is politically expedient to produce massively inarticulate electorates.

It is certainly customary, and has been customary for as long as I can remember, to caricature Australians as terse, even monosyllabic, speakers bordering on the inarticulate. This is actively cultivated by those who wish to promote a John Wayne/(Chips Rafferty?) type myth of the Aussie battler spitting out a hard bitten word to settle the bulldust. Indeed, while the Max Harris's and the civilized may long with anguish for a more articulate generation of young Australians, it seems that the average citizen equates fluency with palaver. We are on our guard against the spiel.

And yet our five year olds love to talk. It seems that by doing what comes naturally, tuning in to what is going on and trying it out for themselves, they have learnt to talk without the benefit of formal teaching.

And so, somewhat wryly, I come to my theme.

In preparing for this talk, I thought I should establish the ingredients for an "on to basics" movement in oracy by searching for those conditions which seem to promote talk in the pre-school years and by hypothesizing that these same conditions might continue to promote oracy if they could be replicated in schools. Having established these basics, I might then speculate about more formal, planned and "unnatural" elements which could be adopted in schools to make them less accidental and incidental teachers than life. Such an approach should also take account of the present conditions in Australian schools.

And so, this paper has three parts; one, an investigation of the conditions most likely to promote growth and progressive realization of meaning making potential in oral communication; two, a summary of the findings of two pieces of South Australian research and three, an attempt to tease out implications for teaching oracy in Australian schools.

ED180033

CS502747

I The Conditions Most Likely . . .

Parasitically, I made a quick journey through selected writings of Stratta, Wilkinson, Halliday, Britton, Novick, Waters, Bernstein, Sapir, Vygotsky, Bruner and Croft* to find out what might happen if schools tried to replicate the best features of language learning before and outside school. In brief, this is what I extracted.

TRACKING

"... One can see that the baby is leading the dance. The mother is slightly behind, tracking his movements and responding in kind. By an analogous process, for months and even years the mother, and possibly others too may continue to track the child's language development ..." (Halliday, 1977)

Halliday points to a secret teachers need to learn. The mother and the close-knit early "meaning" group of the child do not actively set out to pump new language into the infant. They delicately and sensitively tune-in to the meanings which emerge. They attend and respond.

"To understand another's speech, it is not sufficient to understand his words - we must also understand his thought. But even that is not enough - we must know his motivation." (Vygotsky, 1962)

CARING AND SHARING

Wilkinson and Stratta talk of the need for "imaginative empathy" (1977), a similar notion to tracking. Halliday calls this "inter-subjectivity" (1977) a term he borrows from Trevarthen. Collaboratively, the child and the "meaning" group build up the language to represent and refer to things held in common. The picture that emerges is one of caring adults kindly licking language into shape by their responses. But the meaning maker's meaning is sacrosanct.

THE MEANS-ENDS TIE UP

"Here in the home, then, there is a direct means-end tie up between speech and what it achieves for the speaker. Can we preserve that direct relationship throughout the years of schooling?"
(Britton, 1977)

The hypothesis is that children learn language so brilliantly because it so powerfully serves their needs. Britton and others isolate the following functions of talk.

1. Synpractic and Ego-centric talk as it serves cognition

The work of Luria, Vygotsky and Ruth Weir suffices to convince us that talk helps children get their minds around things.

2. Communication through Conversation

"Though some of this conversation will consist of an expression of wants and needs, most of it will be by way of comment: in Susanne Langer's words, 'Young children learn to speak ... by constantly using words to bring things into their minds, not into their hands.'" (Britton, 1977)

3. Expression

This includes delighting in what Croft calls the "auditory imagination", celebrating what Britton calls the "me-ness" of things", enacting, symbolizing and making sense of the subjective life of mind. It is the artistic function, every bit as satisfying as conversation about the "thingness of things."

Britton argues that home is a near perfect language workshop:

"... the give-and-take, the rough-and-tumble of language as it is unselfconsciously used for work and play in the home, constitutes a better learning situation than would anything more deliberate."
(Britton, 1977)

THE MATURE-SPEAKER AS CONVERSATIONALIST

Novick and Waters (1977), cite Brodbeck, Irwin and Goldfarb (1945, 46) as gatherers of evidence that "children cared for in institutions and hospitals have considerable deficit and this is presumably due to the absence of verbally oriented interactions between a significant adult and a very young child". In their own study Novick and Waters see the adult as a very important bridge of misunderstandings, promoter of compromise and giver of rulings. Halliday emphasizes the role of the intimate adult as socializing agent helping the child to get "socio-semantic" and "socio-semiotic" perspectives on the life of the community (Halliday, 1977). The work of many researchers into language acquisition (e.g. McNeill) also draws attention to the role of the adult as expander of elliptical utterances, thereby assisting the gradual unfolding of a syntax approximating ever more closely to the adult model. The more varied the interactions with adult speakers and the more responsive the language environment, the more likely it seems that the child will develop into a powerful meaning maker.

Bernstein throws further light on the likely harmful effects of institutions, by examining the difference between "person-oriented" and "status-oriented" interactions with children. The "person-oriented" home as Bernstein depicts, or caricatures, it, encourages elaboration, and the making of implicit meaning. In the "status-oriented" home the child is more acted upon than acting.

THE PLAY WAY

Transcripts of pre-sleep monologues by Weir (1962) and Boomer (1976) show quite dramatically the child's strong drive towards metalinguistic playing around with what Britton calls "... patterns, ploys and routines" (1977). (I would add "intonations".) At times the play on and with words is followed by reflection and appreciation, suggesting that the child is engaged in an almost calculated exercise in code-cracking, pattern finding and verbal aesthetics.

"A piggy back
A piggy back on me ...
We had a piggy
A piggy nick ...
A piggy nick?
Oh, that's another good word" (Boomer, 1976)

Bruner underlines the value of this kind of activity:

"Play has the effect of drawing the child's attention to communication itself, and to the structure of the acts in which communication is taking place." (Bruner, 1975)

Croft in the paper prepared for this conference makes a similar point with respect to both the productive and receptive modes:

"I believe that most, if not all, of the early childhood experiences we now recognize as vital to general language acquisition, that is personal and projected play, music, story telling, rhymes, jingles, lullabies, games, riddles, conversation, creative art work and socialization, are all germane and generative to the development of the auditory imagination." (Croft, 1979)

CHALLENGES AND TRANSACTIONS

"We did find that transactional language doubles in quantity out of class ... Children seemed to find the need or the opportunity to linguistically influence others more often in the schoolyard than in the classroom. The data suggest that in the schoolyard the children have a more personal stake in what they say." (Novick and Waters, 1977)

In playing "The Carpenter Game" in their research, Novick and Waters established a context in which children had to discuss choices throughout in order to complete a task cooperatively. They found a high degree of negations in the transcripts and suggest that this seems to indicate a high level of challenge and involvement.

Anyone eavesdropping on young children at play is likely to find a similar high level of negations.

CONCEPTUAL GROWTH

Sapir sees the child's language growing "in constant association with the colour and requirements of actual contexts". (Sapir, 1961) Wilkinson says "one learns language by being in a situation that calls language forth" (Wilkinson, 1971). Novick and Waters stress that conceptual growth through having to deal with the demands of new contexts and linguistic challenges is at the heart of language growth. Oversimplified, the formula might read "the wider the range of contexts and challenges in which the child has a personal stake, the more profound will be the language development".

EXPLORATORY TALK

Stratta and Wilkinson (1977) have documented some excellent examples of children engaged in using language exploratively and in listening with tolerance while others explore. "Meaning for each individual is being accumulated and modified operationally in the course of the discussion. Furthermore, each individual makes what he can of the discussion in the light of his own individual experience, which, although having common touchstones with others is, nevertheless, unique."

Britton makes a similar point when he underlines the need for children to have the opportunity "to match new meanings of words and utterances with what is already known about the world" (Britton, 1977)

Gusdorf nicely summarizes the role of the ideal listener when such exploratory connections are being made. "Like a comb through tangled hair," he says, "the words of another can help bring order" (Gusdorf, 1965).

This kind of talk is crucial to cognitive development which is in turn essential for continued linguistic growth.

* * * * *

I do not pretend that these eight features extracted for comment represent all the conditions likely to promote oracy. I do suggest, however, that they make a good starting point for any search for the 'basics' of oracy. How might Australian schools fare measured against such criteria?

II And so to school ...

Official system's curriculum guides say many of the things outlined in Part I. (Davis and Clark survey such curriculum statements in their paper Oracy: Breakdown or Breakthrough, ERDC: unpublished.) Most are, however, very thin when it comes to offering operational strategies, maps or suggested structures for an "oracy" programme. Consequently, many teachers are easy prey for pseudo-taxonomists and laboratory vendors who invent plausible sets of sequenced sub-skills and then offer guided tours at a price. Others who instinctively sense the toxic qualities of such programmes, may be content to rely on the truism that we learn to talk through talking. But this can so easily degenerate to the re-cycling of present ignorance. Others, still, suspicious of the new commercial curriculum package but needing to appease nagging guilt, bring out the remedies of antiquity to make a programme of traditional bits and pieces of show and tell, language games, debates, mock councils and listening "comprehensions" without a great deal of thought to sequence, purpose or principles of language development.

At the risk of seeming presumptuous, I hazard a guess, based on widespread observation of Australian schools at all levels over many years, that few have a clearly articulated policy (in action) or a functioning plan for "oracy" in the curriculum. Many junior primary schools are adopting certain naturalistic approaches but often this is a veneer over deeply entrenched views of the child as "deficient", in which case it is easy to detect patronizing relationships and pseudo-attentiveness. In primary schools the fragmented approach may be giving way to integration around themes, but I suspect that this is often an ingenious and tenuous ploy for taking the old fragments and packaging them in a new way. As for secondary schools, talk is rarely part of the official assessment and so the reality is that few teachers and students take it seriously. Perhaps, I can defend this fiction by referring to two pieces of recent South Australian enquiry; one at the lower primary level and the other in four secondary schools.

Novick and Waters (1977) in their intensive study of children's talk at years 1, 2 and 3, are scrupulously careful not to draw glib conclusions or to offer neat answers about strategies for the future. I shall try to be equally careful in extracting from their work.

They confirm what people like Flanders and Barnes have shown in other places that teachers do talk a lot (up to 70% of the time) and that when teachers join groups of children at talk they usually reduce the language flow.

"When teachers participated, the children's utterances were reduced by 40% at year 1 and 27% at year 3." It is also interesting to note that in this situation more than half of the teacher's utterances were questions.

At the same time Novick and Waters repeat a number of times, in a number of ways, that wise mediation by mature adults is a key element in language learning, and that there is a need for more conversation on a one to one basis in the early years of schooling.

A fascinating aspect of the Novick and Waters findings is that SES differences cannot be easily detected at year 1 but are becoming more apparent by year 3. It is also interesting to note that working class children gradually withdraw over the years from initiation of conversation with the teacher although at year 1 they initiate twice as often as higher SES children. Such information makes it hard to refrain from asserting that schools actually teach SES language differences or, to put it another way, that children gradually learn to behave according to the teacher's perception of their SES.

Novick and Waters remark on the constricting nature of much teacher questioning which forces the classroom response to be compressed to one or two word answers. Their radio microphones confirm that longer utterances are elicited in the playground. They suggest that children in schools don't seem to have the same stake in what is happening inside.

In comparison with Bernstein's work in England, it is interesting to note two conclusions from the South Australian study:

- "• While the working class child may not perform as well cognitively (certainly as measured by school success), there is no indication that this failure is produced by his language.
- Differences in the language performance of social class groups are less marked in Australia than in Britain or the United States." (Novick and Waters, 1977)

This research is teeming with information that could suggest ways of improving the conditions for oracy in schools. I will confine myself to just a few observations based on this work.

It is imperative that we develop ways of training our teachers in how to organize for new structures conducive to talk. This includes the fiddliest of details in terms of instructions, seating arrangements (the presentation of space is crucial) and intervention strategies. Above all, we need to discover ways of increasing one to one conversation with mature speakers (this includes ways of using vertical grouping, inter class visiting, etc.). The importance of issuing

challenging tasks which will promote negation and concerted collaboration emerges as does the critical nature of concept development (children must be continually put into new territory and assisted to formulate understandings).

With respect to curricula, teachers must be helped to define the crucial processes, activities and situations which will continue the language growth of the first five years.

The way to do this, say Novick and Waters, is not through exercises where no person-to-person interaction is involved and it is certainly not through the kind of "misguided" programmes that Engleman and Bereiter popularized in America nor through the patronizing 'talk reform' techniques of Gahagan and Gahagan (which grew out of an over zealous response to the early Bernstein).

At the secondary level, my own work with the Language Across the Curriculum Project concentrated on individual teacher enquiry into perceived language and learning problems. It did not focus on specific 'oracy' programmes within the subject English. What it produced was a picture of schools as environments for languaging.

Before the project started, we asked teachers in the four participating schools to comment on perceived language problems and their causes. With respect to talk the predominant complaints were about "laziness", "slang" ("they relax in class areas and their use of slang annoys me") and "careless language" ("they almost seem to delight in it"). The causes were variously seen as lack of concentration, lack of clarity, "constant exposure to television" and "insufficient grounding in the basics". Only three teachers out of 172 indicated that the schools or the teachers might be in any way contributing to the perceived problems.

After many enquiries and seemingly endless tape recordings of classroom interaction the project officers made these concluding remarks about talk after citing a number of documented cases:

"Thus the norm was -

1. Teacher controls the input of knowledge.
2. The lessons are tightly structured around content.
3. Teacher has a definite pathway in mind and rejects discussion that is an excursion.
4. Teacher talks most of the time.
5. Teacher is the initiator.
6. Teacher language is very subject-specific.
7. Teacher questions are information-seeking and do not invite open exploration.
8. Student participation is minimal and limited to short utterances in response to closed questions.
9. Student answers must be precise.

We found situations involving any of the following extremely rare -

1. Teachers having an end point in mind but allowing students to walk a variety of paths.
2. Teachers being colloquial and hence allowing students a point of entry into the knowledge.
3. Teachers asking lots of open questions.
4. Teachers allowing the language of home and playground into the classroom.
5. Students thinking aloud.
6. Students initiating sequences.

We have tape-recorded several teacher-student exchanges in a one to one situation and have found little variance from the above. The teacher still has a pre-conceived end in mind and carefully drops hints to manoeuvre the student towards that end. The language resulting from this is limiting and very task orientated and it is doubtful the student reaches a clearer understanding of the subject." (Boomer, Richards and Zubrinich, 1979)

This leads the team to remark:

"It is only when the language of the classroom is flexible and serving many functions that students will make new meanings. Imagine a classroom that allows all these things to happen; storytelling, use of personal anecdote, hypothesizing, wondering, passing on information (telling), reflecting.

What we have said so far has wider implications of course. If the kind of talk occurring in the classroom is to change then such things as -

- (a) teacher-pupil relationships,
- (b) the balance of power,
- (c) teacher perception of the curriculum,

will also have to change."

(Ibid)

When it comes to the subject of questioning in schools, the concluding comments are pointed:

"It appears as though students rarely feel inclined to question teachers and teachers rarely feel inclined to encourage them to do it. This situation has been well documented and commented on by the likes of Barnes, Bellack and Flanders, but it is nevertheless a rather peculiar phenomenon. Why is it that teachers spend much of their time asking questions when they already know the answers, and students who are ostensibly seeking answers, ask far fewer questions?

We find this paucity of student questioning rather disturbing, particularly when a search through all our transcripts yielded only one example of a speculative question asked of a teacher. Almost as rare were teacher questions which invited students to speculate. ...

It would be foolish of us to suggest that students do not ask searching questions, or engage in exploratory talk in schools, but we do wonder where this sort of activity occurs. There was certainly very little evidence of it in full class discussions, and little more in small group discussions. Presumably questions are asked in children's heads, or perhaps they are sometimes surreptitiously aired behind a protective hand when a child is driven to question a peer. It is almost as if schools are deliberately trying to inhibit learning."

(Ibid)

Another section of the conclusion looks at linguistic registers used by teachers and text books. Sections of transcripts of lessons and extracts from texts are quoted to show the kind of bafflement which occurs in schools. The team is not impressed by some of the 'simplistic' attempts to overcome this by replacing "big words with smaller words", or by teaching the 'meaning' of the big words. With an obvious debt to Frank Smith and Kenneth Goodman, the writers assert the following:

"Words do not have meanings which dissolve in children's cognitive structure - it is the children who bring the meanings to words. The most important information in these processes lies not in the print or in the sounds, but in the children themselves, in the knowledge which they bring to the task. Both reading and listening are predictive processes: when listening to or reading an utterance the child is constantly utilizing his knowledge of the language and of the subject of the utterance in order to predict what will come next. That is, he is constantly processing information as he reads or listens. If the complexity of an utterance is such that s/he is unable to utilize this knowledge s/he is forced to rely only on the information in the printed page, or in the sounds heard. This means that the child reads or listens almost on a word by word basis; thus his/her memory is overtaxed, his/her information processing apparatus becomes overburdened, and the utterance becomes incomprehensible noise."

(Ibid)

Now, after many years of wondering about schools as institutions where there are unwritten laws about what can and what cannot be said, after examining our impressive evidence that the talk in classrooms is overwhelmingly teacher talk, after looking at evidence from elsewhere, and after thinking about unburnished, rusting swords, I understand why ours is not a particularly articulate society. In Negotiating the Curriculum, a paper based on the Language Across the Curriculum Project, I conclude that it all revolves around the uses of power:

"Now my specific concern is to promote more open communication, more talk to exchange and seek information, and more questioning to relieve mystification because one of our basic assumptions in the South Australian Language and Learning Unit is that learning is vitally connected with the language resources which can be brought to serve it.

A more equitable distribution of power, or at least a more healthy exercise of power, which we know can be used either benevolently to let in or maliciously to exclude, will not come while those in power monopolize the talking space, that is the language, thereby keeping other people in relative ignorance."

III So What? ...

"We think a child learns his native language systematically and naturally, without any formal tuition or formal testing. This learning, we think, can continue in a similar manner throughout the period of formal schooling."

(Novick and Waters, 1977)

I support this view, but I believe that schools should also be able to intensify the learning process, increase the repertoire beyond what might be naturally acquired outside, and add to the students' power by helping them to understand how language works in the world. I also believe that schools have a specific function to teach the "language of schools" as well as subject specific languages and meta languages. However, the principles for learning these things should be the same as those which apply in the learning of the basic mother tongue.

If we were earnest in our intention to promote oracy in schools, we would set about developing a taxonomy not of sub-skills, but of situations which would make certain language demands, related to the language demands of the real world (including the real world of academia). Then we would try to arrange these in some sort of developmental sequence without claiming divinity. Having done this, we could then consider how to translate the known principles (Part I) into a pedagogical recipe which, I suggest, might go like this: "Expose the learners to plenty of examples of the register (or language task), challenging them to "crack the code" and to begin to produce their own version. Then provide ample opportunity for trial, error and feedback. As proficiency develops, allow plenty of time for reflection on how it works. Put the emphasis on a workshop-type approach and make sure that the learner sees purpose in the endeavour. Throughout the sequence, make sure that the teacher role is consistent with the best practice of mature adults who nurture the growth of the pre-school child. The learner should be convinced of the need to guess, to take risks and to bring previous knowledge to bear on the new challenge. It would be of great help if the teacher could show, where appropriate, how he or she does it him or herself, giving access to his or her own thoughts about it. Avoid fragmented exercises. Concentrate on whole tasks. Teach component skills where needed. Learn how to organize the class into groups and how to negotiate without degenerating into chaos.

Once we had this straight we would need to look to the tone of the institution. If it were formidably an Institution the odds would be against one teacher trying to establish free flowing language. It might mean that compromises would be needed. If most of the other teachers do not share the frame of mind, it is likely that the students will try to tyrannize the individual teacher back into the norm. The very strong will make it work.

CONCLUSION

Nothing much will come of my words or the words of anyone else at this conference; nothing much will come of the most precise and enlightened central curriculum statements; nothing much will come of national projects and academic research; unless teachers, parents and administrators "own" and understand the sort of basic principles outlined in Part I of this paper. And so, if I could wave a magic wand

I'd temporarily wind up ACER projects, CDC projects, and system's curriculum development teams and spend all the money saved on a nationwide advertising campaign. I don't much want to be in life if people can't talk about it with me. What does it profit a person if s/he escapes lung cancer or heart disease but is left with withered utterance? Talk, be in it. Quite seriously, ignorance, persisting mythologies and ingrained fears about talk are our greatest enemy.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Boomer, G. and Spender, D., (1976), The Spitting Image, Rigby, Adelaide.
- Boomer, G., Richards, N. and Zubrinich, R. (1978), Language Across the Curriculum: An Experiment in Learning, unpublished M.S., Adelaide.
- Britton, J.N. (1977), "Talking" in English in Secondary Schools, English Teachers Association of NSW, Sydney.
- Bruner, J. (1975), 'The Ontogenesis of Speech Acts', Journal of Child Language, Vol. 2, no. 1.
- Croft, M. (1979), 'Auditory Imagination', unpublished conference paper.
- Gusdorf, G. (1965), Speaking, Northwestern University Press.
- Halliday, M.A.K. (1977), "How Children Learn Language" in English in Secondary Schools, op. cit.
- Novick, D. and Waters, D. (1977), Talking in Schools, Education Department of S A, Adelaide.
- Sapir, E. (1961), Culture, Language and Personality, Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Vygotsky, L.S. (1962), Thought and Language, Cambridge: M.I.T. Press.
- Weir, R. (1962), Language in the Crib, The Hague: Mouton.
- Wilkinson, A. (1971), The Foundations of Language, O.U.P., London.
- Wilkinson, A. and Stratta, L. (1977), 'Listening and the Teaching of English' in English in Secondary Schools, op. cit.